

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

TARISHA SHARNEE JACKSON,

Plaintiff(s),

v.

GEICO CHOICE INSURANCE COMPANY,
et al.,

Defendant(s).

Case No. 2:25-cv-00537-CDS-NJK

ORDER

Pending before the Court are two orders to show cause why the case should not be remanded for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. Docket Nos. 16, 29. The parties filed responses. Docket Nos. 32, 33.

With respect to the amount in controversy requirement for diversity jurisdiction, the defendants' burden is usually satisfied if the plaintiff's complaint claims a sum greater than the threshold amount. *Gaus v. Miles*, 980 F.2d. 564, 566 (9th Cir. 1992) (citing *St. Paul Mercury Indem. Co. v. Red Cab Co.*, 303 U.S. 283, 288–99 (1938)). In this case, the complaint alleges a variety of damages, including an assertion for punitive damages “in an amount in excess of \$15,000 but likely exceed[ing] one hundred thousand dollars.” Docket No. 1-1 at ¶ 23 (emphasis added).¹ Hence, it appears from the face of the subject complaint that the amount in controversy requirement is met and no indication has been provided that these allegations were not made in good faith. *Cf. Shakhbazyan v. BMW Financial Servs. NA, LLC*, 2024 WL 4360133, at *2 (C.D. Cal. Sept. 30, 2024).

¹ The notice of removal omitted any reference to this specific allegation as to a punitive damages award exceeding \$100,000. *See* Docket No. 1. Nonetheless, the defense highlights this allegation in responding to the orders to show cause. *See, e.g.*, Docket No. 32 at 3, 8-9. Although Plaintiff had an opportunity to respond to the defense's arguments, Plaintiff is silent on this particular allegation in her complaint. *See* Docket No. 33.

1 Accordingly, the Court does not find remand to be warranted and the orders to show cause
2 are discharged.

3 IT IS SO ORDERED.

4 Dated: June 23, 2025

5 
6 _____
7 Nancy J. Koppe
8 United States Magistrate Judge
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28